DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 676 HE 033 528

AUTHOR	Hutchings, Pat; Bjork, Chris
TITLE	An Annotated Bibliography of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, NJ.
SPONS AGENCY	Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	22p.; Produced by the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.carnegiefoundation.org.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Annotated Bibliographies; *College Instruction; *Higher Education; Learning Strategies; *Scholarship; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

In 1998, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching launched an initiative known as the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). This bibliography was complied early in the project to establish a baseline against which progress in the higher education arena might be gauged at the end of its current 5-year funding cycle. The bibliography has three sections. The first, a definitional one, includes significant statements about the idea of the scholarship of teaching and learning, drawn from various traditions that contribute to its evolving conception. The second section provides examples of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Selections in this section attempt to sample work from a variety of fields, in a variety of forms and media, employing a variety of methods. The third section points readers to resources that can assist them in the doing of the scholarship of teaching and learning. The bibliography serves to define a scholarship that focuses explicitly on student learning. It reflects a conviction that the scholarship of teaching and learning can and should take on different forms. Thus, the inclusion of examples ranging from a book-length study to a pedagogical colloquium by a prospective faculty member; from an on-line resource, to a protocol for ongoing collaborative inquiry, to a textbook. A short summary is provided for each listing in the bibliography. (EMS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 676

CASTLHigherEd

The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

An Annotated Bibliography of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

Pat Hutchings, Senior Scholar
and Chris Bjork, Research Assistant
Spring 1999

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Stadtman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE033508

CASTLHigherEd
The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

An Annotated Bibliography of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

Pat Hutchings, Senior Scholar
and Chris Bjork, Research Assistant
Spring 1999

Contents

Preface
Section I: Defining the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Section II: Selected Examples of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Section III: Resources for Faculty Undertaking the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Preface

by Pat Hutchings

In 1998, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching launched an initiative known as CASTL: the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Through its higher education program, co-funded by The Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts, CASTL aims to advance the development of a scholarship of teaching and learning that will

1. foster significant, long-lasting learning for all students;
2. enhance the practice and profession of teaching; and
3. bring to faculty's work as teachers the recognition and reward afforded to other forms of scholarly work.

This bibliography was compiled early in the project to establish a baseline against which progress in the higher education arena might be gauged at the end of our current five-year funding cycle. It also serves to acknowledge the work that CASTL builds on, and to locate this new effort in the longer trajectory of related developments.

The bibliography has three sections. The first, a definitional one, includes significant statements about the *idea* of the scholarship of teaching and learning, drawn from various traditions that contribute to its evolving conception. The second section provides *examples* of the scholarship of teaching and learning; selections here attempt to sample work from a variety of fields, in a variety of forms and media, employing a variety of methods. The third section points readers to resources that can

assist them in the *doing* of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

In all of its three sections, the bibliography is necessarily selective. For starters, the desire to have a baseline against which developments in higher education can be gauged has led us to limit the document to items from that context--though knowing there is a large and thoughtful body of work at the K-12 level that higher education can learn from. Indeed, much of the work in higher education has parallels or precursors in the K-12 world, and CASTL's K-12 program will foster further work in this arena. We have also limited ourselves to documents that are readily available, excluding, that is, the many fugitive materials (most notably examples) that might otherwise be illustrative. Indeed, one of the goals of CASTL is to make what is currently fugitive publicly available—since publicness is a defining feature of scholarship.

The bibliography is also selective in another way. It is not simply a listing of extant work. It is an attempt to say something about the emerging vision of the scholarship of teaching and learning that stands behind and drives the work of CASTL; to map, if you will, an understanding of its history, parameters, and prospects, and the various lines of work and scholarly traditions that contribute to it. Three themes can be highlighted in this regard.

First, this bibliography serves to define a scholarship of teaching that focuses explicitly on student learning—hence the program title: the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching *and Learning*. We want to be explicit about our primary interest in questions about student learning, about what it takes to foster significant lasting forms of student learning, about what that learning looks like, and about the forms of evidence and documentation that will allow the various disciplines, interdisciplines and professional fields that constitute higher education to foster such learning more effectively. With this in mind, our selection of examples in part two of the bibliography focuses on questions about learning, and the resources listed in the third section are, many of them, about the character of student understanding and its assessment. In both, we have included items that deal with a broad range of student learning outcomes, including, for instance, those associated with civic and moral education, and with the ability to live and work in an increasingly diverse global world.

Second, the bibliography reflects a conviction that the scholarship of teaching and learning can and should take different forms. The word "scholarship" will, for many faculty, conjure up the image of a traditional published article, monograph, or book; many will also assume that scholarship about teaching must mean a social science model of inquiry. But, as illustrated by the selection of examples in the second section of the bibliography, a much wider variety of forms and methods and "genres" are now emerging. Thus, we include examples ranging from a book-length study to a pedagogical colloquium by a prospective faculty member; from an on-line resource, to a protocol for ongoing collaborative inquiry, to a

textbook. We have attempted, as well, to represent work from a variety of fields employing a variety of methods: narrative, case study, control group studies, and others. Finally, the examples illustrate the different kinds of questions that scholars of teaching and learning might ask, from the immediate and instrumental (does this new method I'm trying really contribute to my students' learning?), to more theory-building forms of inquiry such as Mina Shaughnessey's classic work on student writing errors. The point is that, for now at least, it is important to *open up* our sense of what is possible and useful. It would be too bad, indeed, if models for the scholarship of teaching and learning were limited in ways that only a few faculty could or would want to undertake.

The third major theme of this document is that the concept and practice of the scholarship of teaching has *multiple* histories, multiple lines of work and traditions that can now be built on. It is important to mention at least some of them here, albeit briefly and no doubt too neatly, since they are more bound up with one another than this account will suggest..

For many in higher education, the most salient history begins with *Scholarship Reconsidered*, the 1990 report by Ernest Boyer, writing as president of the Carnegie Foundation. Boyer contends we must "move beyond the tired old 'teaching versus research' debate and give the familiar and honorable term 'scholarship' a broader, more capacious meaning," one that includes four distinct but interrelated dimensions: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. In thus staking a claim for the scholarship of teaching, Boyer seeks to bring greater recognition and reward to teaching, and is also suggesting that excellent teaching is marked by the same habits of mind that characterize other types of scholarly work (he does not sharply distinguish between excellent teaching and the scholarship of teaching). *Scholarship Reconsidered* has given powerful momentum to a wave of reports and recommendations from both campuses and scholarly societies that share this agenda of bringing greater attention and recognition to teaching.

A different history of the scholarship of teaching and learning focuses on a conception of teaching. As represented by the work of Lee Shulman and others, the argument here is that teaching is not just technique (though technique has gotten the lion's share of attention in teaching-improvement efforts) but an enactment, rather, of our understanding of our disciplinary, interdisciplinary or professional field and what it means to know it deeply. It follows, then, that teaching needs to be reconnected to scholarship and to the scholarly communities through habits of documentation, exchange, and peer review; such processes are not only essential to a greater valuing of teaching but to the advancement of the profession and practice of the field. As Shulman writes in a recent volume on the course portfolio, "a scholarship of teaching will entail a public account of some or all of the full act of teaching—vision, design, enactment, outcomes, and analysis—in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher's professional peers, and amenable to productive employment in future work by members of that same community." For Shulman, the scholarship of teaching may well

accompany or engender teaching excellence, but it is not synonymous with it.

Shulman's work is one of the catalysts for another line of work contributing to the scholarship of teaching: developments in peer collaboration and review of teaching. Most notable here, perhaps, is the multi-campus national initiative undertaken by the American Association for Higher Education from 1994-98. Entitled "From Idea to Prototype," the peer review of teaching project brought together teams of faculty who developed nine strategies for making their work as teachers available to one another, be it for individual growth and improvement, or for personnel decision making. As reports from the project make clear, for many faculty the opportunity to talk with colleagues about their teaching and their students' learning, to be part of a "culture of teaching and learning," and to find colleagueship around this important aspect of their professional lives meets a deeply felt need. These faculty do not necessarily talk about their work as the scholarship of teaching but they are in fact moving very much in that direction: looking carefully at their practice, learning from it, sharing what they're learning with their scholarly peers....

Yet another development to be mentioned here is student outcomes assessment, and particularly that aspect of assessment that focuses on the classroom. K. Patricia Cross must be mentioned here as the pioneer, with her several collaborators over the years, of classroom research and CATS (Classroom Assessment Techniques). Though many faculty have been skeptical about external mandates for assessment at the institutional level, the principle that we might be more purposeful about whether our students are learning what we think we're teaching has caught fire in many settings, and is an important theme in the evolving concept and practice of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Indeed, assessment has helped to make the idea that faculty might examine their own practice in its relation to impact a natural, even inevitable, idea—though not an easy one to enact. A challenge in the next few years is to assist such faculty to pursue their questions about student learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning in ways that will make a real difference.

Finally, I would mention as an important milestone toward current work on the scholarship of teaching and learning the 1997 Carnegie Foundation report, *Scholarship Assessed* by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff. Often described as a kind of sequel to the "Boyer report," this volume pulls together, in its six standards for "assessing scholarship in all its forms," many of the developments noted above. In looking at teaching through the standard of "significant results," for instance, the authors ask (as assessment does) whether goals for student learning are achieved but also (as Shulman asks) whether the scholar's work adds "consequentially to the field" and whether it opens "additional areas for further exploration." Similarly, in discussing the standard on "presentation," they note: "teaching and applied scholarship can remain incomplete acts unless presentation at some point reaches beyond students, clients, or the public in order to connect with colleagues," an expectation

puts that peer collaboration and review into the picture. Indeed, peer review is a central theme of *Scholarship Assessed*, and the AAHE project on that topic is often cited.

There are other traditions and histories that might be mentioned here: formal educational research (though as suggested by Lee Shulman's overview of "the disciplines of inquiry," cited in the bibliography, that tradition itself encompasses a wide variety of approaches), reflective practice, work in the disciplines--composition studies for example, and chemistry--that have long-standing traditions of scholarly inquiry into matters pedagogical, and work that has been done under the banner of faculty development....In short, faculty undertaking the scholarship of teaching and learning need not start with a blank page.

Our hope is that this bibliography will be helpful in filling that page—whether by those for whom the kind of work featured here is part of a clear career trajectory, newcomers to the work, or, indeed, those simply curious and even skeptical about the meaning and value of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Subsequent iterations and materials of other sorts will be available through CASTL over the next few years.

top

Section I:
Defining the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.*
Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

> Boyer argues that if higher education is to meet its full range of responsibilities the concept of scholarship must be broadened to include not only basic research but other kinds of intellectual work in which faculty engage. Toward this end, four types of scholarship are proposed: the scholarship of discovery (traditional, basic research); the scholarship of integration (including such work as textbook writing, or synthetic reviews of literature in the field); the scholarship of application (professional service, or outreach, which draws on scholarly expertise); and the scholarship of teaching. For many educators, it was this Carnegie report that introduced the phrase "the scholarship of teaching."

Brookfield, Stephen D. 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher.* San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.

> "Critically reflective teaching happens," Brookfield tells us, "when we identify and scrutinize the assumptions that undergird how we work" (xii). He suggests four "lenses" for getting at and investigating these underlying (and often problematic) assumptions, including teacher autobiography, the perspective of

students, the perspective of colleagues, and the theoretical literature on pedagogy. Brookfield does not use the term scholarship of teaching but his vision of teachers interrogating their own practice overlaps with emergent meanings of the term.

Cerbin, William. 1996. Inventing a New Genre: The Course Portfolio at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. In P. Hutchings, *Making Teaching Community Property*, pp. 52-6. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

In this essay—one of a number he has written on course portfolios--Cerbin describes how he came to see teaching as a sort of laboratory or experiment, subject to scholarly investigation: "I was familiar with teaching portfolios. . . But thinking about teaching as scholarly inquiry began to lead me in the direction of something I had not seen anyone else doing: a portfolio that focused on the course rather than on one's teaching. Being a social scientist, I began to think of each course. . .as a kind of laboratory—not as a controlled experiment, but as a setting in which you start out with goals for student learning, then you adopt teaching practices that you think will accomplish these. So the course portfolio was a natural way for me to go, one that followed from my ideas about teaching and learning. I'm not sure I saw this immediately, but one thing I now see is that the course portfolio is really like a scholarly manuscript—not a finished publication, but a manuscript, a draft, of ongoing inquiry" (pp. 52-53).

Cross, K. Patricia. 1990. Teachers as Scholars. *AAHE Bulletin* 43 (4): 3–5.

This brief piece begins "with a bold thesis," as Cross says, "that teaching is emerging as one of the most profoundly intellectually challenging aspects of our jobs as college faculty" (3). While pointing to the typically "primitive state" of teaching, she highlights the growing body of research about student learning and argues that improvement depends on shifting our focus from the characteristics of the teacher to the interaction between teaching and learning. Arguing that "the intellectual challenge of teaching lies in the opportunity for individual teachers to observe the impact of their teaching on their students' learning," she foresees the day when faculty will treat their classrooms as laboratories for the study of learning (5). Cross's work on classroom assessment and classroom research provides tools for this kind of study.

Cross, K. Patricia, and Mimi Harris Steadman. 1996. *Classroom Research: Implementing the Scholarship of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arguing that faculty might usefully investigate their

own practice and students' learning, Cross and Steadman provide three extended case studies of how such investigations might be undertaken, along with a culminating chapter on "Designing Your Own Classroom Research." The opening chapter situates classroom research and the scholarship of teaching in the larger context and traditions of research on teaching and learning..

Cutler, William W., III. 1997. The History Course Portfolio. *Perspectives* 35 (8): 17–20.

Cutler describes how historians can use course portfolios to organize and display the scholarly argument behind decisions about the format and substance of individual courses. He describes different approaches to portfolios and the benefits of building them—both to the individual teacher of history and to the field. *Perspectives* is the newsletter of the American Historical Association. (As indicated below, Cutler's own portfolio is available on line through the AHA website.)

Diamond, Robert M and Bronwyn E. Adams (eds.). 1995. *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

This volume brings together statements on rewarding faculty work from nine disciplinary/professional societies—religion, history, geography, math, chemistry, the arts, business, journalism, and family/consumer science, plus the National Education Association. A central cross-cutting theme is that teaching is substantive, intellectual work, deserving the time and attention of faculty, careful evaluation, and institutional reward. Subsequent to this volume, Diamond has worked with additional fields that are developing such statements.

Edgerton, Russell. 1994. A National Market for Excellence in Teaching. *Change* 26 (5): 4–5.

Edgerton argues that "excellent teachers don't have to live out their careers as unknowns, victims of a national market that only recognizes scholars who publish" (4). Building on the idea that teaching is a form of scholarly work, Edgerton proposes three conditions under which a national market for scholars-as-teachers might be established: a visible product representing teaching excellence, peer judgment, and new forms of public recognition.

Edgerton, Russell, Pat Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan. 1991. *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Like later AAHE work on the course portfolio, this

volume is both a practical guide and a conceptual framework. That is, the vision of portfolios here is based on a view of teaching itself as scholarly, intellectual activity; to see teaching primarily as technique, the authors believe, is to overlook its essential grounding in the teacher's conception of his or her field and what it means to know it deeply. Drawing on the work of Lee Shulman and his research team at Stanford, the authors call for portfolios organized around, and designed to sample, performance on "key tasks of teaching." Eight illustrative portfolio entries--work samples plus reflective commentary—by faculty in a variety of fields are also included.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This sequel to Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* provides a framework of six standards for evaluating the range of scholarly work that faculty undertake—be it basic research, applied work, or teaching. The six standards are: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. Particularly in the emphasis on reflective critique, *Scholarship Assessed* moves toward a view that the scholarship of teaching is more than excellent teaching, suggesting that it also entails practices that lead to new understandings on the part of the teacher, subject to peer review by colleagues.

Halpern, Diane, et al. Scholarship in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, December 1998: 1292-1297.

This report from a task force of eighteen psychologists from institutions across the country contends that the definition of scholarship commonly used in their field no longer fits current realities. They propose that a broader, more precise definition replace the current one, which, they believe, over-emphasizes research. The group suggests five types of scholarly work: a) original research, b) integration of knowledge, c) application of knowledge, d) the scholarship of pedagogy, and e) the scholarship of teaching in psychology.

Hutchings, Pat (ed.). 1988. The Course Portfolio: How Faculty Can Examine Their Teaching to Advance Practice and Improve Student Learning. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

In 1994, the American Association for Higher Education launched a multi-campus project to develop and test new strategies through which faculty could serve as scholarly peers to one another in teaching as they do in research. The course portfolio was one of

these strategies and this volume represents the work of a dozen faculty who, under the aegis of the project, created and tested prototypes of the course portfolio. For readers interested in the scholarship of teaching, Lee S. Shulman's opening chapter is especially helpful in defining the concepts of scholarship and teaching. Shulman writes, "In sum, a scholarship of teaching will entail a public account of some or all of the full act of teaching—vision, design, enactment, outcomes, and analysis—in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher's professional peers, and amenable for productive employment in future work by members of that same community" (6).

Hutchings, Pat. 1996. *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

This volume describes nine strategies through which faculty can make their work as teachers available to one another—be it for individual improvement, for building the collective wisdom of practice in the field, or for personnel decision making. Illustrated by reports from faculty who have used them, these strategies include, among others, teaching circles, reciprocal classroom observations, team teaching, and external peer review. All of these are predicated, as the opening chapter points out, on a view of teaching as scholarly work. Three corollaries unify this vision: teaching as a process of ongoing reflection and inquiry; the need for collegial exchange and publicness; and faculty's professional responsibility for the quality of their work as teachers.

Hutchings, Pat. 1993. *Using Cases to Improve College Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

This volume focuses on the potential of cases to represent the complex, situated character of teaching and learning. Included are a number of examples of such cases, as well as chapters that provide practical guidance for those who wish to write cases or use them to foster substantive intellectual discussion of teaching and learning. Of particular relevance to the evolving conception of a scholarship of teaching is the second chapter, "The Case for Cases: A Deeper Rationale," which posits that cases reflect a shift in our understanding of teaching, from technique to scholarly work. Much of the most important work with cases has gone on in teacher education circles.

Palmer, Parker. 1993. Good Talk About Good Teaching: Improving Teaching Through Conversation. *Change* 25 (6): 8–13.

Palmer diagnoses "some of the deepest dissatisfactions in academic life" as products of the privatization of teaching. This piece describes leadership strategies,

discussion topics, and ground rules for "creating a community of discourse about teaching and learning." This process--though Palmer does not explicitly make this link—is a prerequisite for developing the scholarship of teaching and learning—and also, perhaps, one of its most important consequence.

Shulman, Lee S. Disciplines of Inquiry in Education. In R. Jaeger (ed.), *Complementary Methods for Research in Education* (2nd edition), pp.3-30. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Shulman's opening essay in this collection offers a set of "dimensions" (problems, investigators, methods, settings, and purposes) for examining the variety of methods that are part of the repertoire of educational research. His analysis makes clear the wide range of approaches possible and also helps locate the scholarship of teaching and learning within this range.

Shulman, Lee S. 1993. Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude. *Change* 25 (6): 6-7.

The reason teaching is not move valued in academe, Shulman argues, is not because campuses don't care about it but "because the way we treat teaching removes it from the community of scholars" (6). Thus, he calls for teaching's reconnection to the disciplinary and professional communities in which faculty pursue their scholarly work—a change that would require faculty to document their pedagogical work and put it forward to their peers for review: "We need to make the review, examination, and support of teaching part of the responsibility of the disciplinary community" (6).

Weimer, Maryellen. 1993. The Disciplinary Journals on Pedagogy. *Change* 25 (6): 44-51.

An element of emerging conceptions of the scholarship of teaching is the need for publicness—that faculty must have access to one another's work in order to advance the practice and profession of teaching. New forms of capturing and exchanging the scholarship of teaching are beginning to develop, but many fields also have long-standing journals for pedagogical work. To what extent are they—or might they be—outlets for an emerging scholarship of teaching and learning? In this piece, Weimer comments in depth on three of the more well-established of these journals (*Journal of Marketing Education, Teaching of Psychology,* and *Journal of College Science Teaching)* and also looks at the character of our published discourse about pedagogy more generally. She calls for less imitation of traditional social science and more attention to alternative but rigorous forms and genres for representing what teachers know and do. The article ends with a set of recommendations, which speak not

only to the editors of these journals but to faculty wishing to direct their scholarship in this direction.

top

Section II:
Selected Examples of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Bass, Randy. http://www.georgetown.edu/bassr/portfolio/amlit/

A faculty member in American Studies at Georgetown University, Bass has developed a hypertext course portfolio for his American Literary Traditions course. Writing in the 1998 AAHE volume on course portfolios (cited above), Bass notes, "I chose to write a portfolio for American Literary Traditions because I created the course with the intention of testing a set of assumptions about new approaches to teaching an introductory American literature course. Specifically, I wanted to introduce new technologies...and I wanted to see if these technologies, in combination with other pedagogies and methods, could successfully support an approach to American fiction that emphasized the complexities of literature and narrative form, but in a way very accessible students who were new to the subject" (91). Two key elements of the portfolio are sections on "pedagogical intentions," and an extensive examination of evidence of student learning. Bass notes, "Writing the course portfolio...has given me an opportunity to reflect seriously on two semesters of experimentation both in the context of my own professional development and as a contribution to the field of teaching American literature" (91).

Blum, Lawrence. 1998. Can We Talk? Interracial Dialogue in the University Classroom. *Change* 30 (6): 27-37.

In this narrative account of his experiences leading a graduate-level seminar on Race and Racism, Blum describes the challenges he faced in helping students cross racial barriers and learn from another. The piece is structured around a series of journal entries he wrote over the course of the semester to document and reflect upon the progress of class discussions about race and identity. This approach results in a representation of practice which is highly contextual and concrete but that also allows Blum to reflect on the significance of the experience in generalizing ways.

Byrnes, Heidi. 1995. One Department's Faculty Hiring Experience. *AAHE Bulletin* 47 (9): 7, 9-10.

The term "scholarship" typically connotes published work, but the scholarship of teaching may also assume other kinds of public forms and manifestations. A new format for focusing on teaching in the hiring process in the German Department at Georgetown University

might, for instance, be considered an example of the scholarship of teaching. Drawing on Lee Shulman's concept of the "pedagogical colloquium"—a public presentation on the teaching of the field, parallel to the research colloquium expected of most faculty job candidates--Byrnes describes a model her department has employed: the candidate first talks about his or her intellectual history, then provides a brief description of recent scholarly work, concluding with reflection on teaching practices; finally, audience members engage the candidate in discussion about the material presented. Brynes reports the positive effects this approach has had on hiring decisions and departmental culture.

Cambridge, Barbara L., and Anne C. Williams. 1998. *Portfolio Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Portfolio Learning is a textbook. It is an unusual textbook—one that can be seen as an example of the scholarship of teaching and learning—in that the authors are explicit throughout about the inquiry-based pedagogical framework behind the design of the textbook. It is, in a sense, their account of how composition theory and research-based understandings of how writers move from novice to expert are enacted in a particular kind of teaching-and-learning context. Moreover, *Portfolio Learning* is built around an instance of the authors' own scholarship of teaching and learning: a longitudinal case study of the experience and learning of an actual student in a portfolio-learning course.

Cerbin, William. 1995. Connecting Assessment of Learning to Improvement of Teaching Through the Course Portfolio. *Assessment Update* 7 (1): 4-6.

This piece argues for "learner-centered evaluation" and illustrates what such evaluation would look like through an excerpt from Cerbin's own course portfolio (which is otherwise unpublished, though it has been widely circulated), focused on a classroom activity employing student groups. Cerbin's effort in the portfolio is to discover and document whether and to what extent students grasp the key concepts he endeavors to teach. In keeping with the spirit of scholarship, he is less concerned with proving that his teaching is successful than with uncovering problematic aspects of the teaching and learning process, and exploring issues.

Coppola, B. P., S.N. Ege, and R.G. Lawton. 1997. The University of Michigan Undergraduate Chemistry Curriculum. 2. Instructional Strategies and Assessment. *Journal of Chemical Education* (74): 84-94.

As indicated by the journal title here, chemistry is one of the fields with a well established history of

scholarship on teaching and learning issues. As indicated by the title of the article, Coppola and his co-authors focus on the University of Michigan chemistry program, which initiated work on a new curriculum in 1989. What makes t e piece an example of the scholarship of teaching and learning is its distance from the usual "show and tell." It is rather, an analytical piece, deeply embedded in practice, drawing on related work and advancing a model for learning in chemistry that is potentially relevant in multiple settings.

Crossroads Classroom Research and Study Project. http://www.georgetown.edu/crossroads/conversations/

Crossroads is, as this site tells us, "a faculty study project on using technology to teach all areas of culture and history related to interdisciplinary American Studies." Of particular relevance to the scholarship of teaching and learning is the "conversations" section of the site--a forum for faculty to share and interact around case studies of teaching practice. In their complexity and "situatedness," these case studies might be seen as cousins to course portfolios; the on-line discussion of them can be seen as the development of a scholarly community of discourse around issues of teaching and learning with technology (the site also includes examples of "ways to gauge student encounters with technology-enhanced pedagogies and practices"). The Crossroads project is directed by Randy Bass, American Studies faculty member at Georgetown University.

Cutler, William W., III. http://www.chnm.gmu.edu/aha

This site provides an on-line version of the course portfolio developed by Temple University history professor William Cutler. The portfolio aims to document and examine how his choice of three intellectual themes—freedom, diversity, and migration—shapes the lectures, discussions, assignments, and examinations in an introductory survey course in American history. The portfolio explicitly examines evidence of student learning. Additionally, Cutler includes the "pedagogical diaries" of his two TA's in order to build in different perspectives on class events, to enrich his account of the course, and to mitigate subjectivity. The site (click on Teaching Concerns, then AHA/AAHE Teaching Portfolios) is the product of a collaboration between the American Historical Association and the AAHE project on the peer review of teaching, which resulted in a "history course portfolio working group" that operated in parallel with the multidisciplinary AAHE group. Cutler's portfolio is the first in what will perhaps be a larger set posted on the site.

Heath Anthology of American Literature.
http://www.hmco.com/college/english/heath/index.html

> This site is an online companion to the *Heath Anthology*, edited by Paul Lauter. Of particular interest to those interested in the scholarship of teaching and learning is the section entitled "Hypertext Syllabus Builder," (a feature designed and edited by Randy Bass) which includes accounts by faculty across the country of the rationale, conduct, and impact of their American literature courses.

Maher, Francis H. and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault. 1994. *The Feminist Classroom*. New York: Basic Books.

> An extended study of women's studies classrooms in five universities, this book explores the following questions: How do gender and diversity shape teaching, learning and the production of knowledge? What forms of interaction emerge when such diversities occur? Using ethnographic methods, Maher and Tetreault study the work of seventeen professors who are experimenting with feminist pedagogies in their classrooms. In keeping with feminist frameworks for analysis, Maher and Tetreault approach the study not as distanced, objective observers but as personally involved researchers whose social and political positions shape their research questions.

Martsolf, Donna. 1998. A Course Portfolio for a Graduate Nursing Course. In Hutchings (ed.), *The Course Portfolio: How Faculty Can Examine Their Teaching to Advance Practice and Improve Student Learning*, pp. 25-8. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

> Martsolf's piece in this volume is one of nine case studies by faculty who have used course portfolios to "examine their teaching and improve student learning." The portfolio itself it not included in the volume but the case study provides a quite full picture of it, and illustrates why it is indeed an example of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Martsolf discusses, for instance, her interest not only in reflecting on and documenting her teaching of a key course in the Kent State University nursing curriculum (she undertakes the portfolio with an upcoming tenure decision in mind) but putting forward her "fairly unorthodox approach to the teaching of nursing theory to colleagues at the national level." The organizing principle of the portfolio is Martsolf's goal of helping students get beyond a view of nursing and a way of knowing that is "particularistic, tradition-based, and focused on the "doing" and the "bottom line." The portfolio both documents and, Martsolf says, improves her success in moving students to a deeper level of understanding.

Passow, Eli. 1995. Exercises 1, 2, and 3. In *From Idea to*

Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching: A Project Workbook. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

As part of a national project on the peer review of teaching, participating faculty completed three "exercises" (see entry for *From Idea to Prototype* in section three, below) in which they examine their own practice in a key course. Eli Passow, a mathematician at Temple University, examines a basic math course, in terms of design, implementation, and results. The three exercises together constitute a sort of course portfolio in which Passow makes and supports an argument for a particular course design based on his conception of the field as students in the course need to understand it. Passow's exercises are behind tab 4.

Ritchie, Joy, and Amy Goodburn. 1996. Collaborative Inquiry in the Teaching of Writing Theory and Practice at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. In Hutchings, *Making Teaching Community Property*, pp. 73-6. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Often the scholarship of teaching and learning begins with a specific question (see, for instance, Randy Bass's account of the impetus for his course portfolio above) but this example by Ritchie and Goodburn stems primarily from a view of teaching: "We have become more strongly convinced that teaching at its best is not an isolated, solitary act. Good teaching and good theory, as bell hooks reminds us in *Teaching to Transgress*, are always collaborative....Our collaboration emerges directly and intrinsically from our philosophies about teaching and research as fundamentally dialogical activities" (76). In this spirit they set out to examine and more deeply understand their practice through an ongoing process of examination and reflection grounded in journals, conversation, examination of student work, and reciprocal visits. The process itself is an example of the scholarship of teaching, but it is worth noting that Ritchie and Goodburn's work led to several grant-funded projects with larger audiences. .

Sharkey, Stephen. 1993. Social Structure and Personal Freedom. *Change* 25 (6): 30-37.

Sharkey's is the first in what is actually a set of essays (all in this issue of *Change*) aimed at exploring student learning of difficult concepts in sociology. Using a case-study approach, Sharkey captures the frustrations he experienced in attempting to press students in an introductory course to comprehend the concept of social structure. The pieces that follow, all written by other sociologists, respond to Sharkey's piece with commentary, criticism, and research that shed light on student reaction to the material. Although the four commentaries were written independently, as a collection they provide a model of

how a peer group focused on the scholarship of teaching might function.

Shaughnessy, Mina. 1977. *Errors and Expectations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

In this classic study of students who enrolled in the CUNY system when an open admissions policy was enacted, Shaughnessy examines students' errors as writers as a reflection of their approach to and understanding of the writing process. Errors are framed not as random mistakes but as windows into student thinking. As an example of the scholarship of teaching and learning, this study can be characterized as empirical, theory-building (Shaughnessy posits the teacher as mediator between languages that students bring to class and the language of the academy) and highly significant in the history of thought and practice in literacy and composition studies.

Wright, John. 1996. A Collaborative, Comparative Study of Student Learning in Chemistry at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In Hutchings, *Making Teaching Community Property*, pp. 79-81. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Wright's work began with a problem in his analytical and equilibrium chemistry course: Even his A students could not, he found, transfer their learning from one setting to another. Attempting to remedy this situation, he transformed his class by incorporating student groups, and a more project-based approach. To evaluate the effectiveness of this new approach, Wright assessed outcomes in his course (as judged by 25 faculty trained as external reviewers) and compared them to outcomes in a course taught in the traditional manner.

top

Section III:
Resources for Faculty Undertaking the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. 1997. Peer Review of Teaching: A Strategy for Improving Teaching and Learning. Produced by AACSB, February 20, 1997. Videocassette.

Participants in this network-quality videoconference discuss strategies for documenting and reviewing the scholarship of teaching, and the experiences of business schools participating in the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) national project From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching. This tape can be purchased at the AACSB website: http://www.aacsb.edu. Choose Workshops and Seminars, then Video Conferences, and finally,

Order Form for Videotapes.

American Association for Higher Education website. http://www.aahe.org

This site offers resources related to AAHE's array of programs. Of particular use to those interested in the scholarship of teaching and learning is the "Teaching Initiatives/Peer Review" section, which includes numerous materials (exercises, detailed meeting agendas, links to campus reports and resources) from AAHE's project on the peer review of teaching. See Teaching Initiatives, then click on Peer Review.

Angelo, Thomas A., and K. Patricia Cross. 1993. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers* (2nd edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This hefty but well-organized, user-friendly volume suggests strategies that faculty can use to collect feedback from students in order to assess the effects of their teaching and to make appropriate adjustments. Each strategy is illustrated with examples from a range of disciplines. This volume operates on the premise that faculty can use classroom assessment and classroom research to answer their own questions about their own students' learning.

Barr, Robert B., and John Tagg. 1995. From Teaching to Learning—A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education. *Change* 27 (6):12-25.

In keeping with the development of a scholarship of teaching and learning, Barr and Tagg call for a shift from an "instruction paradigm" (which they believe characterizes most of higher education) to a "learning paradigm" in which all aspects of the institution's work would be driven by and assessed in light of impact on student learning. "The learning paradigm envisions the institution itself as a learner—over time, it continuously learns how to produce more learning with each graduating class, each entering student" (13). This is not a "how-to" piece but it may provide a helpful framework for action by faculty undertaking the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Bernstein, Daniel J. 1996. A Departmental System for Balancing the Development and Evaluation of College Teaching: A Commentary on Cavanagh. *Innovative Higher Education* 20 (4): 241-248.

Bernstein coined the phrase "teaching circles" and established their use at the University of Nebraska. This piece deals not with the mechanics of teaching circles but with their place in a larger set of departmental activities and practices, both formative and summative. Bernstein describes a longitudinal,

multi-year process, which begins with the creation of a climate in which there are regularly scheduled occasions for peer conversation and interaction about teaching issues.

Cambridge, Barbara L. 1996. The Paradigm Shifts: Examining Quality of Teaching Through Assessment of Student Learning. *Innovative Higher Education* 20 (4): 287–98.

Cambridge argues that learning is the chief goal of teaching and that faculty can thus assess teaching through analysis of student work. She is particularly interested in the power of involving students in this process, and describes three practices that bring together faculty, faculty peers, and students as partners in examining and assessing teaching and learning. Both student and teacher portfolios play a role in what Cambridge proposes.

Chism, Nancy Van Note, Jane M. Fraser, and Robert L. Arnold. 1996. Teaching Academies: Honoring and Promoting Teaching Through a Community of Expertise. In Menges and Svinicki (eds.), *Honoring Exemplary Teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 65 (Spring 1996): 25-32.

One of the strategies campuses might use to foster a scholarship of teaching (and one that is proposed in some of the literature from The Carnegie Academy) is the "teaching academy," defined by Chism and colleagues as "a group of faculty who are considered excellent or highly interested in teaching and who have been tapped by their institutions to engage in advocacy, service, or advising on teaching matters" (25). Examples from ten campuses are briefly summarized here, and an eleventh, at The Ohio State University, is described in detail. At its best, the teaching academy model would seem to be a structure for support of the scholarship of teaching, for instance when (as the authors report of some examples) goals include the creation of community among teachers and the fostering of research on college teaching and learning.

Duffy, Donna Killian, and Janet Wright Jones. 1995. *Teaching Within the Rhythms of the Semester*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

A rare look at the unfolding of the teaching and learning process over the course of the semester, this volume is especially pertinent to the second component of course portfolio design and to the scholarship of teaching and learning that looks at the ongoing interactions of a course. Additionally, Duffy and Jones recount their use of portfolios as a dynamic tool for faculty development—a way of charting the progress and impact of classroom assignments and activities.

Golin, Steve. 1990. Four Arguments for Peer Collaboration & Student Interviewing: The Master Faculty Program. *AAHE Bulletin* 43 (4): 9-10.

> The New Jersey Master Faculty Program pioneered the use of reciprocal classroom visits (in combination with student interviews and reflective writing/consultation) as a way for faculty—working in pairs--to examine and learn from their own teaching practice. Golin, who served as director of the program, provides both a rationale for its effectiveness and a brief step-by-step protocol. Evaluation of the program after five semesters (and participation by 300 faculty) indicates that faculty make major changes in their teaching as a result of the program.

Hutchings, Pat (ed.). 1995. *From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching: A Project Workbook*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

> Readers will find in this spiral-bound "workbook" a collection of materials, examples, and tasks developed through a multi-university national project on the peer review of teaching. Faculty seeking to examine their teaching practice may be especially interested in the "three exercises" (behind tab 3) which provide a protocol for reflective writing about three components of teaching: 1) the syllabus, as a reflection of the scholarly argument behind the design of the course; 2) the activities through which that design is enacted from week to week; and 3) evidence of student learning. Many faculty in the project used their written responses to these exercises as the basis for a course portfolio; many also used them as occasions for reflection discussion with colleagues.

Malik, David J. 1994. Peer Review of Teaching: External Review of Course Content. *Innovative Higher Education* 20 (4): 277–86.

> Malik recounts efforts in the chemistry department at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis to institute a new approach to the evaluation of teaching, designed to supplement student ratings and to provide the kind of external scholarly perspective employed with research. Materials sent out for review (by senior faculty in the department), include course descriptions, syllabi, and reflective memos. Malik also reports on the usefulness to the department of new insights and different perspectives gleaned from external reviewers' comments.

Morehead, Jere W., and Peter J. Shedd. 1996. Student Interviews: A Vital Role in the Scholarship of Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education* 20 (4): 261-270.

> Morehead and Shedd argue that rich information from students, about their learning and their experience of a course, is a key source of evidence that should be

used to document and review teaching. Additionally, the authors tell the story of their own use of interviews as grist for rethinking and reshaping practice.

Shulman, Lee. 1995. Faculty Hiring: The Pedagogical Colloquium: Three Models. *AAHE Bulletin* 47 (9): 6-9.

Having proposed the idea of the pedagogical colloquium in an earlier piece ("Teaching as Community Property," above), Shulman here suggests three protocols for its conduct. "One of the puzzlements about the pedagogical colloquium," he writes, "is what, exactly, we would want the candidate to talk about" (6). Three possible models are then presented: the course narrative, in which the candidate explains the shape or "argument" of a selected course/syllabus; the colloquium in which the candidate talks about how to teach a key concept or idea in the field; and the dilemma-centered colloquium, in which the candidate reflects publicly on some problematic aspect of teaching--e.g., the right balance between breadth and depth. These models might be useful frameworks for inquiry in a variety of settings—not only faculty hiring.

University of Wisconsin Teaching Assistant Program. http://www.cae.wisc.edu/~tafellow/homepage.shtml

Like many programs, the College of Engineering at the University of Wisconsin–Madison sees considerable turnover among TAs, making it difficult for the program to learn from and build on teaching practice from semester to semester. To address this problem, a group of TAs proposed and pioneered the use of course portfolios. See this site for a look at the program's handbook for creating them. Choose "Previous TA Fellows and Their Projects," then "Course Portfolio Development."

top

Back to the CASTL Higher Education page